



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Philological Argument for the Inspiration of the New Testament.*—The inquiry is made into the evidence bearing upon the question of the divine inspiration of the New Testament which is to be found in the transforming influence exerted by the Christian faith upon the Greek language, as it may be traced in the New Testament writings. The distinctively Christian element in the Greek is exhibited in many important words: (1) *world*, as mankind alienated from God; (2) *age*, in its ethical sense, man apart from Christ; (3) *flesh*, the lower self; (4) *life and death*, in their spiritual meaning, relation to Christ; (5) *Heavenly Father*; (6) *gospel*; (7) *save, saviour, salvation*, rescue from sin; (8) *grace*, in its pauline sense; (9) *faith, believe in, on*, as trust in a person; (10) *to be born from above, a new creation*, the change of the ruling purpose; (11) *love* [agape]; (12) *in Christ*,—the most striking of the phrases expressing what is characteristic of Christianity, real, constant and intimate spiritual communion with Christ and through him with God. The use of these phrases and words was not owing to relations which these writers had with the Divine Christ while on earth, but owing to a special divine illumination because (1) no unaided human reason could have worked out these new ideas; (2) the difference between these writings and other Christian writings of those ages. It is more than a difference; it is a painful contrast. These men did not possess transcendent natural endowments, above all their contemporaries. They were peculiarly enlightened by the Holy Spirit.

This method of seeking the truth about inspiration is a particularly good example of inductive reasoning. The idea is an attractive one and the working out exceedingly painstaking and valuable. Sometimes the writer seems to exaggerate too strongly the differences in thought and expression between the writers of the New Testament and others of their time. But in general his position is sound and his conclusions valid.

Inspiration of the New Testament Writers.†—Two introductory topics are: (1) The task assigned the New Testament writers. It was to interpret the types and symbols of the old dispensation and demonstrate their fulfillment in Jesus Christ—a task which demanded men surpassing the greatest of Israel's prophets. (2) Their native fitness for this work. The twelve had no such fitness. They misconceived and were ignorant of Jesus' purpose and character during his life. Even Paul was not given his knowledge of Christ through his previous training. The writers of the New Testament were Jews, and what mere Jews, even the most learned, could do, is seen in the Talmud. Our Lord's verdict on these disciples was that they were to wait for the Spirit before they were equipped. We conclude that apart from a supernatural agency, such as the verbal theory of inspiration implies, the task would have been imperfectly done, if at all. The views of Paul as to the agency of the Spirit, expressed in 1 Corinthians, are that his teachings and the language in which they were expressed were divinely determined. Paul's view of the natural man as unable to grasp the teaching of God implies that such an one could not express it in words. This does not mean that every godly man is inspired. If inspiration rests on godliness, why should one godly man defer to another? So much for Paul. The other apostles were inspired on the day of Pentecost. As for Mark and Luke, (1) they were companions of the apostles, (2) they probably had supernatural gifts of the spirit, (3) the internal evidence of their writings proves their inspiration. The crowning argument is this. Our Lord

* By Rev. Edward L. Houghton, in *The Universalist Quarterly*, Oct., 1889, pp. 389-411.

† By Robert Watts, D.D., in *The Presbyterian Quarterly*, Oct., 1889, pp. 578-588.

Jesus was inspired by the Spirit. Prophecy (Deut. 18:15-19) declares that this extends to his words. Other passages (John 12:49, 50; 17:8) prove it. So also in the Revelation, his messages to the churches are inspired by the Spirit. If he needed verbal inspiration, surely the New Testament writers needed it. The testimony of the Scriptures, then, is that the Spirit determined their form and language as well as the ideas. The rejection of the doctrine that the Scriptures are the offspring of an inspiration which determined the language employed by the sacred writers involves, logically, the rejection of the Bible as the word of God.

A presentation of the theory of verbal inspiration which is certainly unqualified and vigorous. The adherents of other views would not accept the characterization of their theories which is here given. This argument, as well as those of other schools, is weak in its failure to bring forward a reasonable induction of Scripture material—not isolated texts—in support of its claims.

The Babylonian Flood-Legend and the Hebrew Record of the Deluge.*

—Two Babylonian accounts of a flood have reached us; one discovered by George Smith on the cuneiform tablets, another written by Berosus, a priest of Babylon, and preserved in Eusebius. Both relate to the same event. (1) What is the relation of the subject-matter of the cuneiform account to the deluge recorded in Genesis? A comparison of the two reveals (a) the theme of the two accounts is the same; (b) the Hebrew narrative, at least as a whole, has not been derived from the cuneiform; the accounts are independent *save in their common origin*. They are variant versions, differing in the episode of the birds as to number, kind and actions, in the number of people in the ark, and especially in the polytheistic coloring of the cuneiform as over against the monotheism of the Hebrew. They are two independently transmitted traditions. (2) What is the date of the cuneiform? Even in the present form it belongs to a period very much earlier than the seventh century B. C. (3) What is the character of this cuneiform story? (a) In its present form it comes from Sumir-Accad; (b) it is an epic, not mythical but historical. (4) What light does it throw on the related Hebrew narrative? (a) It testifies that the Hebrew account came not by direct revelation but by tradition. Probably it was brought by Abraham to Canaan. It was used as a tradition by Moses, edited by him; as such it is historically accurate. (b) The testimony of the cuneiform account is in opposition to the theory that the Hebrew contains two interwoven accounts of the deluge. It is probable that the old traditions current in Israel were gathered up into this one account, not parcelled out among a variety of writers. In the very points in which the critics see diversity, there is seen similar diversity in the cuneiform story. This fact weakens the evidence for two contradictory accounts in the Hebrew. (c) The exegetical help afforded by the cuneiform story is slight. The land Nitsir, there mentioned as the landing-place of the ark, is near the district called Urtû. This suggests a similarity with Ararat (Urtu).

A thoughtful and scholarly discussion of this important and fascinating subject.

* By Prof. John D. Davis, Ph.D., in *The Presbyterian Review*, July, 1889, pp. 415-431.